

Determinacy and Δ_3^1 - degrees

P.D.Welch

School of Mathematics, University of Bristol.

July 16th 1996

Abstract

Let $D = \{\mathbf{d}_n\}$ be a countable collection of Δ_3^1 degrees. Assuming that all co-analytic games on integers are determined (or equivalently that all reals have “sharps”), we prove that either D has a Δ_3^1 -minimal upper bound, or that for any n , and for every real r recursive in d_n , games in the pointclasses $\Delta_2^1(r)$ are determined. This is proven using Core Model theory.

1 Introduction

The main theorem of [11] is the following:

Theorem 1.1 ($ZFC + \forall r \in \mathbb{R} (r^\# \text{ exists}) + \neg 0^\dagger$) *Every countable set of Δ_3^1 degrees has a minimal upper bound.*

We say that for reals $f, g \in {}^\omega\omega$ f is Δ_3^1 in g , or $f \leq_3 g$, if there are Σ_3^1 relations Φ, Ψ expressible in second order number theory so that $f(n) = m \Leftrightarrow \Phi(n, m, g) \Leftrightarrow \neg \Psi(n, m, g)$. This is a reducibility ordering, and setting $f =_3 g \Leftrightarrow f \leq_3 g \ \& \ g \leq_3 f$ we have that $=_3$ is an equivalence on ${}^\omega\omega$. We let $\mathbf{f}$ denote the equivalence class $[f]_{=_3}$.

In general, when $\leq_r$ is a reducibility ordering (meaning $\leq_r$ is a transitive, reflexive partial ordering, extending $\leq_T$, Turing reducibility, so that if $x \leq_r y$ and $z \leq_r y$ then $x \oplus z \leq_r y$ holds, where $x \oplus z$ is the recursive union of x with y) we shall use $\leq_r$ to denote also the partial ordering amongst r -degrees so induced.

If D is a set of r -degrees, we say that $\mathbf{e}$ is an r -minimal upper bound for D if

$$\forall \mathbf{d} \in D (\mathbf{d} \leq_r \mathbf{e}) \wedge \forall \mathbf{g} (\forall \mathbf{d} \in D (\mathbf{d} \leq_r \mathbf{g} \wedge \mathbf{g} \leq_r \mathbf{f}) \rightarrow \mathbf{f} =_r \mathbf{g})$$

By the expression “ $r^\#$ exists” we mean that there is a closed and unbounded class of indiscernibles, C^r , for $L[r]$, the constructible closure of L with r , and by $O^\dagger$, the existence of such a class of indiscernibles for $L[\mu]$ - an inner model for a measurable cardinal – if such exists. By “ $\neg O^\dagger$ ” we mean that such a class does not exist. For information on games see [2]. By contrast with Theorem 1.1 Kechris had earlier shown [3]:

Theorem 1.2 ($ZFC + \Delta_2^1$ -Determinacy). *If $D = \{\mathbf{d}_n\}_{new}$ is a countable collection of Δ_3^1 degrees, that all lie within a single Q -degree, then D has a minimal upper bound.*

At first sight it is tempting to conjecture:

Conjecture 1 ($ZFC + \forall r (r^\# \text{ exists})$) Every countable collection of Δ_3^1 -degrees has a minimal upper bound.

Whilst Theorem 1.2 lends weight to this assuming Δ_2^1 -determinacy, there was a large gap between this assumption and that of Thm 1.1. It is the purpose of this note to close that gap. We prove:

Theorem 1.3 *Assume $ZFC + \forall r (r^\# \text{ exists})$. For every countable set $D = \{\mathbf{d}_n\}$ of Δ_3^1 -degrees, either D has a Δ_3^1 -minimal upper bound, or for every n , for any $r \in \mathbf{d}_n$ $\Delta_2^1(r)$ Determinacy holds.*

The inner model machinery we use is due to Steel [10] building on the fine-structure of iterations trees, due to Mitchell & Steel [7]. We assume the reader is familiar with [7], [10], and [11]. The

basic structure of the proof of Theorem 3 is still that of [11]. This note details how [11] may be amended or “read” to show how to relax the extra assumption of [11], and still make the proof of Theorem 1.3 go through. We shall occasionally try to avoid wholesale repetition by assuming the reader has a copy of [11] to refer to.

We first prove fairly directly the following weakening of 1.3.

Theorem 1.4 *Assume there are two measurable cardinals, and that Δ_2^1 -Determinacy fails. Then every countable set of Δ_3^1 degrees has a minimal upper bound.*

We indicate at the end how this assumption can be weakened to that of sharps for reals to get 1.3

2

The basic tools of Theorem 1.1 were the Σ_3^1 -correctness of the Dodd-Jensen Core Model, K_{DJ} , together with the analysis of Σ_3^1 sets as unions of $\aleph_1$ -Borel sets of [12], where the codes of the Borel sets could be taken from reals coding wellorders and mice, from K_{DJ} . Essentially this analysis held because the class of uniform indiscernibles C for reals could be computed in K_{DJ} as

$$\bigcap_{r \subseteq \gamma < \omega_1^V} C^r$$

from sharps for bounded subsets of ω_1^V in K . Thus “ $u_n = u_n^{K_{DJ}}$ ” for $n < \omega$.

Here we shall use:

Theorem 2.1 (Steel)[10] 7.9 *Assume there are two measurable cardinals $\kappa < \Omega$, but that there is no inner model of a Woodin cardinal. Then the core model K of [10] is Σ_3^1 -correct.*

We say that a model M is Σ_3^1 -correct, if for any $x \in M$, and any non-empty $\Pi_2^1(x)$ set B of reals, then B has a member $y \in M$. It is still unknown whether $u_2 < \omega_2$ follows from the hypothesis of Theorem 2.1, but its proof does show that computing the uniform indiscernibles for bounded subsets of the lower measurable cardinal κ , yields the same class, both in V and the Steel K .

Let $D = \{\mathbf{d}_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ be a fixed countable collection of Δ_3^1 -degrees. Without loss of generality we assume $n < m \rightarrow \mathbf{d}_n <_3 \mathbf{d}_m$. Let $d_n \in \mathbf{d}_n \cap {}^\omega\omega$ be a representative of each class, and let $z = \oplus \langle d_n | n < \omega \rangle$ some recursive coding of the d_n .

We assume for some n that lightface $\Delta_2^1(d_n)$ -Determinacy fails. Clearly we may assume that $n = 0$, and in fact we shall take $d_0 = 0$ as the proof will relativize uniformly. Initially we shall work under the assumptions of Thm. 2.1, and at the end of the paper indicate that they may be removed, if we continue to assume the existence of $\#$ ’s for reals. For z a set of ordinals, we let K^z be the Steel core model relativized to the predicate z , and $(K^z)^c$ the associated preliminary model (see [10] §§1

- 5). All references to “mice” will mean an ω -sound, ω -iterable mouse as defined in [7], Defs. 2.8.3 & 5.1.4 (unless otherwise stated).

As Δ_2^1 -determinacy fails $K^c \models$ “there are no Woodin cardinals” (cf. [10] 7.14) and all iteration trees then are *simple* (cf. [7] 5.1.2), and furthermore we have a Π_2^1 iterability condition on premice.

Definition 2.2 Let $f \in {}^\omega\omega$. Let τ be such that

$$\langle K_\tau^f, \in, f, E^{K_\tau^f} \rangle \prec_{\Sigma_1} \langle K_{\omega_1}^f, \in, f, E^{K_{\omega_1}^f} \rangle.$$

Then τ is K^f -stable. We set $\tau(f)$ to be the least K^f -stable.

Definition 2.3 $\delta_3^1(f) = \sup\{\|X\| : X \in WO \wedge X \leq_3 f\}$.

Lemma 2.4 If K^f is Σ_3^1 -correct, $\tau(f) = \delta_3^1(f)$ for any $f \subseteq \omega$.

Proof: Just as for δ_2^1 , the first stable ordinal and L , using the $\Sigma_3^1(f)$ -correctness of K^f . **Q.E.D.**

In [11] we used mainly the fact that below a measurable cardinal the constructible closure $K_{\omega_1}[f]$ had the same domain as $K_{\omega_1}^f$. We see no *a priori* reason for this to be true for larger core models (we replace it with Lemma 2.18(iii) below). However:

Lemma 2.5 If $\lambda \leq \omega_1^K$ and $y \in {}^\omega\omega$, then $K_\lambda =_{df} \langle J_\lambda^{E^K}, \in, E^K \restriction \lambda \rangle = (K_\lambda)^{K^y}$.

Proof: Let $\overline{K} = K^{K^y}$.

Claim $\overline{K}$ is a universal weasel.

Proof: By the Weak Covering Lemma for K^y (see [6]) for a cub class $D \subseteq \Omega$ of cardinals, we shall have

$$\beta \in D \rightarrow cf(\beta^{+K^y}) \geq \beta.$$

Similarly building K inside K^y , (note that enough of the measure on Ω survives into K^y for the construction to take place), we appeal to the Weak Covering Lemma for K inside K^y to get the same conclusion on a cub set $D_1 \subseteq \Omega$ of K^y -cardinals

$$\beta \in D_1 \rightarrow cf^{K^y}(\beta^{+\overline{K}}) \geq \beta.$$

Consider the comparison of K with $\overline{K}$ with resultant trees $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}$. (Again we follow [7] §7 in our definition of comparison, excepting that we shall always consider comparisons of mice as terminating in a common model). If $\overline{K}$ is not universal then, by a standard argument, ([10]), §8 there is a cub $E \subseteq \Omega$, with $i < j \in E \rightarrow \pi_{ij}^{\mathcal{T}}(\kappa_i) = \kappa_j = j$ (where $\kappa_i = \text{crit}(E_i^{\mathcal{U}})$) with $\pi_{ij}^{\mathcal{U}} \restriction \kappa_j \subseteq \kappa_j$, whilst

$\pi_{ij}^T((\kappa_i^+)^{M_i^T})$ is cofinal in $(\kappa_j^+)^{M_j^T}$. Letting $i_0 = \min E$, and choosing a regular $j \in E \cap D \cap D_1$, we have $\pi_{0,j}^U(\kappa_j) = \kappa_j$ and $cf(\pi_{0,i}^U((\kappa_j^+)^{\bar{K}})) \geq \kappa_j$ for all $i \leq j$. But the latter is $(\kappa_j^+)^{M_j^U}$ and this has cofinality $(\kappa_{i_0}^+)^{M_{i_0}^T} < \kappa_j$! **Q.E.D.**(Claim)

Consequently on neither side of the coiteration is there any truncation on the main branch. This can only mean $K_\lambda = \bar{K}_\lambda$ for any λ less than the first measurable of K and of $\bar{K}$. **Q.E.D.**

Definition 2.6 For $x \in {}^\omega\omega$ $\Delta_3^1(x) = \{M \mid M \text{ a mouse, } M \in K_{\delta_3^1(x)}^x\}$.

We shall use a relativized form of the above argument:

Lemma 2.7 (i) For $x \in K^y$ $x, y \in {}^\omega\omega$ $\Delta_3^1(x) = (\Delta_3^1(x))^{K^y}$. (ii) If $x \leq_3 y$ then $\Delta_3^1(x) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(y)$

Proof: (i): 2.5, relativized to K^x , shows that, if $\tau = \omega_1^{K^x}$, then $K_\tau^x = (K_\tau^x)^{K^y}$. For (ii): by the same argument, noting that $x \in K^y$ and that $\delta_3^1(x) \leq \delta_3^1(y)$ (both by the $\Sigma_3^1(y)$ -correctness of K^y). The result is immediate. **Q.E.D.**

Corollary 2.8 If $x =_3 y$ then $\Delta_3^1(x) = \Delta_3^1(y)$.

Lemma 2.9 Let $\gamma = \omega_1^{K^f}$, then $K_\gamma^f \models \forall x \exists \alpha [K_\alpha^f \models \exists M \exists \tau (M \text{ a mouse and } x \in L_\tau[M, f])]$

Proof: In K^f define $\bar{K}[f]$ (where $\bar{K} = K^{K^f}$). Let $\widetilde{K}^f = (K^f)^{\bar{K}[f]}$. By the same argument as Lemma 2.5 $|K_{\omega_1}^f| = |\widetilde{K}_{\omega_1}^f| \subseteq |\bar{K}[f]_{\omega_1}| = |K_{\omega_1}^f|$ and so the result is immediate. **Q.E.D.** Let $\delta = \sup_n \{\delta_3^1(d_n) : n < \omega\}$, and $\delta_n = \delta_3^1(d_n)$. We set $\Delta_3^1(D) = \cup_n \Delta_3^1(d_n)$.

The following replaces the notion of “ λ - K -degree” from [11].

Definition 2.10 Let λ be a p.r. closed ordinal, M mouse with $\lambda, On \cap M$. A λ - M -degree is an equivalence class of reals under the relation “ $f \in L_\lambda[M, g]$ ” which we write as $f \leq_{\lambda, M} g$.

($L_\lambda[M, g]$ is the usual constructible closure of M with g). Clearly $\leq_{\lambda, M}$ is a reducibility ordering.

Definition 2.11 Let $f \in {}^\omega\omega$. Let either $\Delta = \Delta_3^1(f), \bar{\delta} = \delta_3^1(f)$ or $\Delta = \Delta_3^1(D), \bar{\delta} = \delta$ be as defined above. Then we set $x \leq_\Delta y$ if $\exists M \in \Delta$ with $x \leq_{\bar{\delta}, M} y$.

It is not hard to see that $\leq_\Delta$ is also a reducibility ordering (for transitivity one needs to observe only that if $x \leq_\Delta y \wedge y \leq_\Delta z$ as witnessed by mice $M, N \in \Delta_3^1(f)$ (resp. $\Delta_3^1(D)$) then there is a mouse $P \in \Delta_3^1(f)$ (resp. $\Delta_3^1(D)$) constructibly coding them both by level δ). Similar remarks hold for $\Delta = \Delta_3^1(D)$. There are thus notions of minimal λ - M , $\Delta_3^1(f)$, and $\Delta_3^1(D)$ -degree etc. Apart

from the first though, they are of limited utility, as $\Delta_3^1(f)$ is too generalised a set of mice. We replace this notion with that of “ $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(f)$ ” defined below.

The proof of [11] used a forcing argument derived from Friedman [1] using perfect trees with various notions of pointedness. For any of the above reducibility notions:

Definition 2.12 *A perfect tree $T \subseteq 2^{<\omega}$ is r -pointed if $\forall f(f \in T \rightarrow T \leq_r f)$.*

Here as elsewhere we shall write $f \in T$ to mean that f codes the characteristic function of a set of sequence numbers coding a branch through T . Throughout this note T and T^* will refer to perfect trees of sequence numbers. The following is an entirely general fact about pointedness:

Lemma 2.13 (Sacks [9] 2.3) *a) If T is r -pointed and $T^* \subseteq T$, T^* perfect, and $T^* \leq_r T$, then $T^* =_r T$, and T^* is r -pointed. b) If T is r -pointed, and $T \leq_r f$, then there is a perfect $T^* \subseteq T$, r -pointed, and such that $T^* =_r f$.*

Let M and λ be as in definition 2.10. Part a) of the next lemma is just an application of the last fact with $\leq_r$ as $\leq_{\lambda, M}$. Part b) is just a variation on the Sacks minimal degree construction performed over $L[M]$.

Lemma 2.14 *a) (cf. [Sacks [9] 2.3]) Let T be λ - M -pointed. Let $f \in {}^\omega\omega$. Then there is an λ, M -pointed $T^* \subseteq T$, such that $T^* =_{\lambda, M} (T, f)$ b) (cf. [Sacks [8], 1.4 & 3.1]) Let T be perfect, M a mouse with $\text{On} \cap M < \lambda$, and suppose $g : \lambda \xrightarrow{(1-1)} \omega, \lambda$ p.r. closed. Then there is a perfect subtree T^* of T , such that $T^* \in L_{\lambda+\omega}[M, g]$ and $\forall f \in T^*((f, T)$ is λ - M -minimal over T).*

Definition 2.15 *A premouse N is reasonable if there is an N -cardinal, $\lambda = \lambda_N > \omega$, with H_λ^N closed under the sharp operation.*

Let $S \subseteq \omega \times {}^\omega\omega$ be a universal Σ_3^1 set; and further require that for any $h \in {}^\omega\omega$, $S^h = \{e | S(e, h)\}$ is a complete $\Sigma_3^1(h)$ subset of ω .

Suppose $S(e, h) \longleftrightarrow \exists g P(e, h, g)$ where P is Π_2^1 . For $e \in \omega$ and for N reasonable, let $S_\lambda^{N, e}$ be the Martin-Solovay tree on $\omega^2 \times u_\omega^N$ defined in N whose projection is contained in P . (For definiteness, let us take the definition of this “MS”-tree as that of S_2 in [5] §2.2. Here we have set $u_1^N = \lambda_N$, and $\langle u_i^N | i \leq \omega \rangle$ enumerates the first ω members of

$$C^N = \bigcap_{a \subseteq \gamma < \lambda_N} I^a \setminus \lambda_N$$

where I^a is the class of Silver indiscernibles for $L[a]$. This sequence is definable in N , and we use these indiscernibles to construct the tree $S_\lambda^{N, e}$.

Remark: (1) A straightforward Löwenheim-Skolem argument using the full Martin-Solovay tree in K for P constructed on the first ω -uniform indiscernible above the lower measurable $\kappa = u_1^K$, shows that if $S(e, h)$ then there is a countable, reasonable N with some $g \in {}^\omega\omega$ so that $(g, h) \in p[S_{\lambda_N}^{N,e}]$.

(2) If $N \in M$ or $N = M$ are reasonable, and $\exists g(h, g) \in p[S_{\lambda_N}^{N,e}]$, and $\lambda_N \leq \lambda_M$ then $\exists g(h, g) \in p[S_{\lambda_N}^{M,e}]$.

Proof: Clearly $H_{\lambda_N}^N \subseteq H_{\lambda_M}^M$; hence by “stretching” the functions $f \in N$, $f : [u_\omega^N]^k \rightarrow u_\omega^N$ (each defined by $L[a]$ terms for $a \in H_{\lambda_N}^N$ with $a^\#$ existing in N) to functions $\bar{f} \in M$ $\bar{f} : [u_\omega^M]^k \rightarrow u_\omega^M$ we get the desired conclusion.

Definition 2.16 (i) $F(e, h) =_{df}$

$\{N \mid N \text{ is a } \leq_* \text{-least reasonable mouse so that } \exists g S_{\lambda_N}^{N,e}(h, g) \text{ is illfounded}\}.$

(ii) $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h) = \bigcup \{F(e, \bar{h}) \cap \Delta_3^1(h) \mid e \in \omega \wedge \bar{h} \leq_3 h\}.$

(i) above fulfills the role of $F(e, h)$ of [11]. Here $\leq_*$ is the natural mouse ordering: $M <_* N$ if the comparison process, *via* ω -maximal iteration trees $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{U}$ to a common model $M_\theta^T = M_\theta^U$, then there has been a ‘drop’ in degree along the main branch $[0, \theta]_U$ or in model, *i.e.* $D^U \cap [0, \theta]_U \neq \emptyset$. The next lemma shows that the mice of $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h)$ are thus the “witnessing mice” for the $\Sigma_3^1(h)$ complete set. For the Dodd-Jensen core model $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h) = \Delta_3^1(h)$ although there seems no *a priori* reason for this to be true here.

Lemma 2.17 $N \in F(e, h) \iff$

$L[N, h] \models “\exists g S_{\lambda_N}^{N,e}(h, g) \text{ is illfounded} \wedge \forall \alpha V^{Coll(\omega, \alpha)} \models “\forall M <_* N \forall g S_{\lambda_M}^{M,e}(h, g) \text{ is wellfounded}” ”.$
 $“N \in F(e, h)” \text{ is thus a } \Sigma_3^1(N, h) \text{ relation}.$

Proof: ($\leftarrow$) If $F(e, h) \neq \emptyset$ but $N \notin F(e, h)$, this is because there is $M <_* N$ with $\exists g S_{\lambda_M}^{M,e}(h, g)$ is illfounded. Let (M, N) be compared with resulting trees $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}$. Then using Remark (2) above, we see, if $P = M_\theta^U$, the last model on $\mathcal{U}$ with $D^U \cap [0, \theta]_U = \emptyset$, that if $\gamma = i_{0,\theta}^U(\lambda_M)$, $\exists g S_\gamma^{P,e}(h, g)$ is illfounded, we may map up the branch, sequence by sequence, to one in $S_\gamma^{P,e}$ using the iteration map $i_{0,\theta}^U$. Let $\alpha = On \cap M$, and then by Shoenfield absolutness, if G is $Coll(\omega, \alpha)$ -generic over $L[N, h]$ we have $L[N, h, G] \models “\exists \text{ countable iteration tree } \mathcal{U} \text{ on some premouse } M \text{ with } [0, \theta] \cap D^U = \emptyset \wedge \exists g S_\lambda^{M_\theta^U,e}(h, g) \text{ is illfounded}.”$ This contradicts our assumptions. ($\rightarrow$) is straightforward. **Q.E.D.**

Lemma 2.18 (i) If $e \in S^h$ then $F(e, h) \cap \Delta_3^1(h) \neq \emptyset$. (ii) $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h)$ is $\leq_*$ cofinal in $\Delta_3^1(h)$.

(iii) $\forall M \in \Delta_3^1(h) \exists N \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h) (M \in L_{\delta_3^1(h)}[N, h])$. Hence $|K_{\delta_3^1(h)}^h| = \bigcup_{N \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h)} |L_{\delta_3^1(h)}[N, h]|$.

(iv) $\forall M \in \Delta_3^1(h) \exists N \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(h) \forall N' \in \Delta_3^1(h) (N' \geq_* N \rightarrow M \in L_{\delta_3^1(h)}[N, h])$.

Proof: (i) follows from the last sentence of Lemma 2.17 since $e \in S^h \iff \exists \alpha K_\alpha^h \models \exists N \in F(e, h) \iff \exists \alpha < \delta_3^1(h) K_\alpha^h \models \exists N \in F(e, h)$.

Suppose for (ii) the given set is not $\leq_*$ -cofinal but there is $M_0 \in \Delta_3^1(h)$ such that $\forall e (e \in S^h \rightarrow \nexists N \in F(e, h) N \leq_* M_0)$.

Claim “ $e \in S^h$ ” is a $\Delta_3^1(h)$ relation (contradicting the assumption on S^h that it is a complete $\Sigma_3^1(h)$ set).

Proof:

(1) $e \in S^h \iff \exists \mathcal{T} \in K_{\delta_3^1(h)}^h$, a countable iteration tree $\mathcal{T}$ on M_0 with last model $M_\infty^\mathcal{T}$ so that “ $\exists g S_\lambda^{M_\infty^\mathcal{T}, e}(h, g)$ is illfounded ”.

Proof: Suppose $e \in S^h$ and let $N \in K_\delta^h$ where $\delta = \delta_3^1(h)$, witness this using (i) above. Let $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T}$ be the trees of length θ resulting from the comparison of N, M_0 . As the latter are both countable, $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{T} \in K_{\omega_1}^h$, and hence in K_α^h for some $\alpha < \delta$. As $N \leq_* M_0$ $D^\mathcal{U} \cap [0, \theta] = \emptyset$, and so, if $S_\lambda^{N, e}$ is the tree defined in N , and $i_{0, \theta}^\mathcal{U}(S_\lambda^{N, e}) = S_\gamma^{P, e}$ where $P = N_\theta^\mathcal{U}$ is the last common model on $\mathcal{T}$ we have $D^\mathcal{U} \cap [0, \theta] = \emptyset$. If $\gamma = i_{0, \theta}^\mathcal{U}(\lambda)$, and if $(g, h, f) \in [S_\lambda^{N, e}]$, we may again map up the branch, sequence by sequence, to one in $S_\gamma^{P, e}$ using the iteration map $i_{0, \theta}^\mathcal{U}$. Hence $(g, h) \in p[S_\gamma^{P, e}]$, and as $M_\theta^\mathcal{T} = M_\theta^\mathcal{U} = P$ we have shown the right hand side. The converse direction is immediate.

Q.E.D.(2)

By Shoenfield absoluteness, we have that the following is true:

(2) $e \in S^h \iff$

$\exists \alpha (V^{Coll(\omega, \alpha)})^{L[M_0, h]} \models “\exists \text{ a countable iteration tree } \mathcal{T} \text{ on } M_0 \text{ so that } L[M_\infty^\mathcal{T}, h] \models “e \in S^h” ”$

Hence “ $e \in S^h$ ” is computable in $L[M_0, h]$, and we may write $e \in S^h \iff n_0(e) \in (M_0, h)^\#$ for some recursive $n_0 \in {}^\omega \omega$. But the latter sharp is in K_δ^h - as M_0, h are.

Q.E.D.(ii)

To see that (iii) holds, let $M \in \Delta_3^1(h)$. Let $X \in K_\delta^h$ be a $\Delta_3^1(h)$ code for M with $X \subseteq \omega$. Let $e_0, e_1 \in \omega$ be such that $n \in X \iff R(e_0, n) \iff \neg R(e_1, n)$ where R is a universal $\Sigma_3^1(h)$ subset of $\omega \times \omega$. Let $\alpha < \delta$ be such that $X \in K_\alpha^h$ and that $\exists \bar{N} \in K_\alpha^h \exists \lambda$ an $\bar{N}$ -cardinal, with $K_\alpha^h \models “\langle e_0, n \rangle \in R \iff L[\bar{N}, h] \models “\langle e_0, n \rangle \in p[S_\lambda^R]” ”$, where S_λ^R is a version of the MS tree for the relation R defined in $\bar{N}$. Let $N \geq_* \bar{N}$ with $N \in F(e, h)$ for some $e \in \omega$. But now argue as at (2) in part (ii) above that

(3): $\langle e_0, n \rangle \in R \iff$

$\exists \beta (V^{Coll(\omega, \beta)})^{L[N, h]} \models “\exists \text{ a countable iteration tree } \mathcal{T} \text{ on } N \text{ so that } L[M_\infty^\mathcal{T}, h] \models “\langle e_0, n \rangle \in R” ”$

hence X and so M is computable in $L_{\delta_3^1(h)}[N, h]$. For the last sentence of (iii) just note that what we did for M we could have done for any $Y \in |K_{\delta_3^1(h)}^h|$.

For (iv) note that we made no intrinsic use of “ $N \in F(e, h)$ ” in (3): any $N' \geq_* \bar{N}$ would do. Since $N' \in \Delta_3^1(h)$ we can bound the “ $\exists \beta$ ” computation, as there, by $\delta_3^1(h)$.

Q.E.D.

We define a reducibility ordering to replace that of “ $\Delta_3^1(T)$ ” from [11]:

Definition 2.19 Set $f \leq_{\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)} g \iff \exists \vec{M} = M_0, \dots, M_k \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T) \quad f \in L_{\delta_3^1(T)}[\vec{M}, g]$

Again there are corresponding notions of $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -degree, minimality, and perfect $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed trees.

Lemma 2.20 (cf. [11] Lemma 9) Let T be a perfect tree, $f \in T$ and let $F(e, f) = N$ for some $e \in \omega$, but $f \notin K^T$. Then there are a perfect $T^* \subseteq T$, $T^* \leq_3 T$, and $M \in \Delta_3^1(T)$ such that

$\forall f \in T^*(F(e, f) \neq \emptyset \wedge \forall P \in F(e, f) P \leq_* M)$. If additionally T is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed and Δ_3^1 -pointed then also $T^* =_3 T$ and T^* is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ -pointed and Δ_3^1 -pointed.

Proof: Let $N \in F(e, f)$. Let $\bar{N} \in K^T$ be $\leq_*$ -least with $\exists g S_\lambda^{\bar{N}, e}(f, g)$ illfounded for some $\bar{N}$ -cardinal λ . Then $\bar{N} \geq_* N$. Let $\alpha = On \cap N$. Let G be a $Coll(\omega, \alpha)$ -generic collapse over $L[\langle T, \bar{N} \rangle^\#]$, and so over $L[\langle \bar{N}, T \rangle]$, with $f \notin L[G, \langle T, \bar{N} \rangle^\#]$. From G define $h \subseteq \omega \times \omega$ coding $\bar{N}$, with $f \notin L[\langle h, T \rangle^\#]$. Thus

$$(1) \quad \exists h (h \text{ codes a mouse } N_h \wedge \exists f \in T (\exists g S_\lambda^{N_h, e}(f, g) \text{ illfounded} \wedge f \notin L[\langle h, T \rangle^\#]) \\ \wedge \forall \bar{h} ((\bar{h} \text{ codes a countable premouse } M \wedge M \in L[\langle h, T \rangle] \models "M <_* N") \rightarrow \forall g S_\lambda^{M, e}(f, g) \text{ is wellfounded}))$$

This is $\Sigma_3^1(T)$ (noting that there is a set of codes $\bar{h}$ of countable premice satisfying the last conjunct which is a recursive in $\langle h, T \rangle^\#$ set, $W_\epsilon^{\langle h, T \rangle^\#}$ say, for some index $\epsilon \in \omega$). Hence there is such an $h, N_h \in K_{\delta_3^1(T)}^T$, and such an f as in (1) with $f \notin L[\langle h, T \rangle^\#]$. For this h, N_h then

$$E = \left\{ f \mid f \in T \wedge \exists g S_\lambda^{N_h, e}(f, g) \text{ is illfounded} \wedge \forall \bar{h} (\bar{h} \in W_\epsilon^{\langle h, T \rangle^\#} \rightarrow \forall g S_\lambda^{M_{\bar{h}}, e}(f, g) \text{ is wellfounded}) \right\}$$

Then E is $\Sigma_2^1(\langle h, T \rangle^\#)$, and contains elements not in $L[\langle h, T \rangle^\#]$. Hence there is a perfect set (given by a $T^* \subseteq T$) of such f , recursive in $\langle h, T \rangle^{\#\#}$. Hence $T^* \leq_3 (h, T) \leq_3 T$. For the last part, if T is Δ_3^1 -pointed, $T \leq_3 T^*$. $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ -pointedness of T^* is then immediate (as is Δ_3^1 -pointedness) **Q.E.D.**

Lemma 2.21 (cf. [F] Lemma 8.) Let T be Δ_3^1 -pointed, and $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed, and suppose $f \in \omega^\omega$. Then there is a $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed $T^* \subseteq T$ such that $T^* =_3 (T, f)$. Any T^* satisfying these conditions is Δ_3^1 -pointed and $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ -pointed.

Proof: By general pointedness arguments, since T is itself $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed, there exists a $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed $T^* \subseteq T$ such that

$$(1) \quad T^* =_{\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)} (T, f).$$

Consequently, setting $\bar{\delta} = \delta_3^1(T)$, for some finite sequence of mice $\vec{M} \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$, $T^* \in L_{\bar{\delta}}[\vec{M}, (T, f)] \subseteq K_{\delta_3^1((T, f))}^{(T, f)}$, so $T^* \leq_3 (T, f)$. Conversely note that $T \leq_3 T^*$ (since $T \leq_3 g$ where g is the leftmost branch of T^* which is recursive in T^*). As $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(T) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(T^*)$ (1) yields $(T, f) \leq_3 T^*$. As $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T) \subseteq \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ and $\bar{\delta} \leq \delta_3^1(T^*)$ we have T^* is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ -pointed.

As $g \in T^* \rightarrow g \in T$ and T is Δ_3^1 -pointed, $T \leq_3 g$, and then $T \in K_{\delta_3^1(g)}^g$. Thus $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(g)$. As T^* is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed, for some mice $\vec{M} \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ $T^* \in L_{\bar{\delta}}[\vec{M}, g]$. But the latter is contained in $|K_{\delta_3^1(g)}^g|$, by the above. Hence $T^* \leq_3 g$ and so is Δ_3^1 -pointed. **Q.E.D.**

Lemma 2.22 Suppose additionally in Lemma 2.14 b), that T is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed and Δ_3^1 -pointed, and that $\omega < \lambda < \delta_3^1(T)$ is p.r. closed. Then, if $M \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ with $On \cap M < \lambda$, the T^* of the conclusion of b) can be taken to be $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ pointed and with $T^* =_3 T$ (and so Δ_3^1 -pointed).

Proof: Set $\gamma = \delta_3^1(T)$. $K_\gamma^T \models \forall \alpha \bar{\alpha} = \omega$. As $\lambda < \gamma$ pick $g \in K_\gamma^T, g : \lambda \xrightarrow{(1-1)} \omega$. Find $T^* \in L_{\lambda+\omega}[M, g]$ as in 2.14 b) with the required λ - M -minimality. Then $T^* \in K_{\delta_3^1(T)}^T$, so $T^* \leq_3 T$. As $T^* \subseteq T$, T^* is Δ_3^1 -pointed. As f , the leftmost branch of T^* is recursive in T^* , we have $T \leq_3 T^*$, so $T =_3 T^*$. As T is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ -pointed, if $f \in T^*$, then $T \in L_\gamma[\vec{M}, f]$ for some $\vec{M} \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$. As $M, g \in K_\gamma^T$, by 2.18 (iii), there is $\vec{N} \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ with $(M, g) \in L_\gamma[\vec{N}, T]$. As $T^* \in L_\gamma[M, g]$ we have $T^* \in L_\gamma[\vec{M}, \vec{N}, f]$ and so T^* is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T) = \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T^*)$ -pointed. **Q.E.D.**

The following lemmas are used to control the growth of $\Delta_3^1(f)$ in our construction. They are used just as [1] Lemmas 2 & 3 are.

Lemma 2.23 Suppose a) f is $\Delta_3^1(D)$ -minimal over D , b) $\Delta_3^1(D) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(f)$, and c) $\forall M \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(f) \exists N \in \Delta_3^1(D) (M \leq_* N)$. Then f is Δ_3^1 -minimal over D .

Proof: By b) clearly $\forall n (d_n \leq_3 f)$. And by a) $\forall n (f \not\leq_3 d_n)$ (for suppose $f \in M = K_\alpha^{d_n}$ for some $\alpha < \delta_3^1(d_n)$; then f is not $\Delta_3^1(D)$ -minimal over D !) Now suppose $\forall n (d_n <_3 h) \wedge h \leq_3 f$. Then $\Delta_3^1(D) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(h) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(f)$. Then, setting $\Delta = \Delta_3^1(D)$:

(1) $\forall n (d_n \leq_\Delta h)$.

But $h \leq_\Delta d_n \rightarrow \exists k \exists M \in \Delta_3^1(d_k) \exists \alpha < \delta_3^1(d_k) h \in L_\alpha[M, d_n]$. Letting $m = \max\{n, k\}$ $h \in L_{\delta_3^1(d_m)}[M, d_m]$. Thus $h \leq_3 d_m$, contradicting our supposition. Hence:

(2) $\forall n (d_n <_\Delta h)$.

(3) $h \leq_\Delta f$.

$h \in K_{\delta_3^1(f)}^f$ implies by Lemma 2.18(iii) $\exists M \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(f) \exists \alpha < \delta_3^1(f) h \in L_\alpha[M, f]$. By b), c) and 2.18(iv) we can pick $N \geq_* M$, $N \in \Delta \subseteq \Delta_3^1(f) \wedge h \in L_{\delta_3^1(f)}[N, f]$. Hence (3) holds. By a) then, $f \leq_\Delta h$. So $f \in L_\alpha[M, h]$ some $M \in \Delta \subseteq \Delta_3^1(h)$ and $\alpha < \delta_3^1(h)$. Hence $f \in K_{\delta_3^1(h)}^h$. Thus $f \leq_3 h$ as required. **Q.E.D.**

For the next lemma as we have $\Delta_3^1(d_n) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(d_{n+1}) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(D)$, we assume we have $\langle M_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ an enumeration of $\Delta_3^1(D)$ in such a way that $\forall i, j < \omega \exists m > i, j \ M_i, M_j \in L_\lambda[M_m]$ where λ is a p.r. closed ordinal $> On \cap M_m$. So let $\langle \lambda_m \mid m < \omega \rangle$ be an ascending sequence of p.r. closed ordinals with $\lambda_m > On \cap M_m$, so that λ_m witnesses this, and with $\sup_m \lambda_m = \delta$. By thinning out the $\langle d_n \mid n < \omega \rangle$ sequence, we may assume that for any n $\lambda_n < \delta_3^1(d_n)$.

Lemma 2.24 Suppose a) $\forall k (f, d_k)$ is λ_k - M_k -minimal over d_k ; b) $\Delta_3^1(D) \subseteq \Delta_3^1(f)$; c) $\Delta_3^1(D) \supseteq \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(f)$; and d) $\forall n (d_n <_3 f)$. Then f is Δ_3^1 -minimal over D .

Proof: Set $\Delta = \Delta_3^1(D)$. First note that $\forall n (d_n <_\Delta f)$ (by b) & d), and using the argument of (2) of Lemma 2.23). We show that f is Δ -minimal, and then the result follows by 2.23. So suppose e) $\forall n (d_n <_\Delta h)$ and

f) $h \leq_\Delta f$.

By f), for some k

(1) $h \in L_{\lambda_k}[M_k, f]$ (using our presumed properties on M_m & λ_m).

Similarly e) shows: (2) $d_k \in L_{\lambda_n}[M_n, h]$ for some $k \leq n < \omega$.

Now consider (h, d_k) . $d_k \in L_{\lambda_k}[M_k, (h, d_k)]$ whilst $(h, d_k) \notin L_{\lambda_k}[M_k, d_k]$ by e). By (1) $(h, d_k) \in$

$L_{\lambda_k}[M_k, (f, d_k)]$. By λ_k - M_k -minimality of (f, d_k) over d_k , we conclude $(f, d_k) \in L_{\lambda_k}[M_k, (h, d_k)]$. Using (2) we have $f \in L_{\lambda_n + \lambda_k}[M_n, M_k, h]$. For some sufficiently large $m > n, k$, $f \in L_{\lambda_m}[M_m, h]$. That is, $f \leq_\Delta h$. Hence f is Δ -minimal as required. **Q.E.D.**

We now have set up all the machinery, to run the main argument of [11] Lemma 13, keeping roughly to the same notations.

We state this as follows:

Lemma 2.25 *Let $D, \{d_n\}, \delta, z, \lambda_n, M_n$ be as above. There is a perfect set $T_0 \in K^z$ so that a) $\forall f \in T_0 \forall n (d_n \leq_3 f)$; b) $\forall f \in T_0 (f \notin \bigcup_n K^{d_n} \rightarrow f \text{ is } \Delta_3^1\text{-minimal over } D \wedge \forall M \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(f) \exists N \in \Delta_3^1(D) M \leq_* N)$.*

Proof: We only sketch the construction which takes place in K^z , defining a binary system of Δ_3^1 -pointed trees $\langle T_s | s \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$. Let e_i be an enumeration of ω in which every integer occurs infinitely often. Let $T_\emptyset = 2^{<\omega}$. Assume T_s has been defined $\forall s \in 2^{<\omega}$ ($lh(s) \leq i$) so that

- a) $lh(s) = j \leq i \rightarrow T_s =_3 d_j$
- b) T_s is $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_s)$ -pointed and Δ_3^1 -pointed.

For $lh(s) = i$, define disjoint $T_{s \smallfrown 0}, T_{s \smallfrown 1}$ disjoint subtrees of T_s according to the following recipe:

- 1) Split T_s into two disjoint subtrees $T_s^* =_3 T_s^{**} =_3 d_{i+1}$, perforce both $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_s)$ -pointed,
- 2) Then find $T_s^o \subseteq T_s^*$, $T_s^o \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_s)$ -pointed, with $T_s^o =_3 T_s^* =_3 d_{i+1}$ and so that

$$\forall f \in T_s^o ((f, T_s^o) \text{ is } \lambda_{i+1}\text{-}M_{i+1}\text{-minimal over } T_s^*)$$

Define T_s^{oo} entirely similarly using T_s^{**} , replacing $*$ with $**$ and o with oo throughout.

- 3) Find $T_{s \smallfrown 0} =_3 T_s^o =_3 d_{i+1} =_3 T_s^{oo} =_3 T_{s \smallfrown 1}$, $T_{s \smallfrown j} \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_{s \smallfrown j})$ -pointed, so that for some $N \in \tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_s) \forall f \in T_{s \smallfrown 0} (\forall M \in F(e_i, f), M \leq_* N)$ if such a $T_{s \smallfrown 0}$ exists. Otherwise set $T_{s \smallfrown 0} = T_s^0$. Similarly define $T_{s \smallfrown 1}$. This induction can take place in any initial segment of K^z , which is a model of ZFC^- , containing $z, \{K_{\delta_3^1(d_n)}^{d_n}\}$ (and so the $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)(d_n)$ etc.)

The perfect tree T_0 of the lemma is that arising from the fusion of the $\langle T_s | s \in 2^{<\omega} \rangle$, and so $[T_0] = \{f \mid \bigcup_{g \in 2^\omega} \bigcap_{N \in \omega} f \in [T_g \upharpoonright_N]\}$. The argument that T_0 is properly defined follows that of [11] with minor changes (replacing $K[d_n]$ with K^{d_n} for example, and replacing $\Delta_3^1(T)$ by $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T)$ throughout). By asking for $\tilde{\Delta}_3^1(T_s)$ pointed trees at each stage we have ensured the construction is absolute between K^z and V , and one may show by induction on $lh(s)$, using 2.20-2.22, that that the trees are in fact Δ_3^1 -pointed in V . We have ensured $\forall f \in T_0 \forall i (lh(s) = i \rightarrow ((f, T_s^o) \text{ is } \lambda_{i+1}\text{-}M_{i+1}\text{-minimal over } d_{i+1} \text{ (a notion absolute between } K^z \text{ and } V) \text{ to fulfill requirement a) of Lemma 2.24. As clearly } d_n \leq_3 f \text{ for any } f \in T_0 \text{ (by } \Delta_3^1\text{-pointedness of } T_s \text{ where } f \in T_s \wedge lh(s) = n), \text{ we have requirement b) of 2.24 (and a) of the current lemma). Now if } f \in T_0 \wedge f \notin \bigcup_n K^{d_n}, \text{ by Lemma 2.20, if } F(e_i, f) \neq \emptyset \text{ then } \forall M \in F(e_i, f) M \leq_* N \text{ for some } N \in \Delta_3^1(D)). \text{ We have that } f, D \text{ satisfy 2.23 c) and the result follows by that lemma.}$

Q.E.D.

The following theorem analogous to [11] Thm 14 is proven similarly *mutatis mutandis*.

Theorem 2.26 *(i) For every $f \in T_0$, f is an upper bound for $\{d_n\}_{n \in \omega}$; if additionally $f \in T_0 \setminus \bigcup_{i \in \omega} K^{d_i}$ then f is a minimal upper bound for $\{d_n\}_{n \in \omega}$.*

- (ii) *There exists a minimal upper bound of $\{d_n\}_{n \in \omega}$.*
- (iii) *There is a least upper bound of $\{d_n\}_{n \in \omega}$ iff $\exists i_0 \in \omega (\mathbb{R} \subseteq K^{d_{i_0}})$.*

We remark now on how to remove the assumption that there are two measurable cardinals $\kappa < \Omega$. The essential ingredient of Lemma 2.25 is to have a ZFC^- model M , containing z which is Σ_3^1 -correct (and so contains all $\Delta_3^1(d_n)$ - thinking of this as the mice coded by $\Delta_3^1(d_n)$ subsets of ω), and so has some ordinal height $\theta > \sup_n \{\delta_3^1(d_n)\} = \delta$. Given then an enumeration of $\Delta_3^1(D) = \bigcup_n \Delta_3^1(d_n)$, and a sequence $\lambda_n < \delta_3^1(d_n)$ with $\sup \lambda_n = \delta$, satisfying the requirement before Lemma 2.24 (which we can define over M), we define a sequence of trees $\langle T_s \rangle$ as above by induction in M . We establish the existence of such a suitable M by the following form of argument (due to Woodin? - this is the kind of argument that Hauser uses to lift the theorem of [12], on all Π_3^1 sets of reals containing Π_3^1 -singletons being equivalent with all reals residing in the Dodd-Jensen K_{DJ} to the context of the Steel Core Model - we should like to thank him for explaining this argument to us.)

We may assume $\forall y y^\dagger$ exists (otherwise for some $y \geq_3 z$ satisfying $\neg y^\dagger$ we could run the argument above using the model $K_{DJ}[y]$ as is done in [11].) But then, we can consider a (or any) canonical inner model arising from $y^\dagger$ with a measure μ on some $\kappa > \omega_1$ containing y , $L[\mu, y]$ say, and using as Ω any of the upper indiscernibles from $y^\dagger$ and as in [10] 7.7, construct a Σ_3^1 -correct model $P = K^z$ in $L[\mu, y]$. Let $\tau = \omega_1^P$, and let $M(y) = P|_\tau$. Note that for any $y' \geq_T y$ a trivial comparison argument shows $M(y)$ an initial segment of $M(y')$. Let M be the union over all such $y \geq_T z$. The following claim shows that M has sufficient properties for the induction to go through.

Claim (i) $z \in M \models ZFC^-$; (ii) M is Σ_3^1 -correct.

For (i), clearly M is of the form $\langle J_\theta^{E^z}, \in, E^z \rangle$ for some $\theta \leq \omega_1$. So assume $\theta < \omega_1$ and that ZFC^- fails. Let w code M and place ourselves in a $L[\mu, w]$. Again a trivial comparison shows us that M is a proper initial segment of $K_{\omega_1^{K^z}}^z$, but M is the union of such! For (ii), if $t \in J_\alpha^{E^z}$ (the latter coded by some real y say) and if B is a non-empty set of $\Pi_2^1(t)$ reals, let $s \in B$, and place ourselves in $L[\mu, s \oplus y]$: $t \in J_\alpha^{E^z}$ is an initial segment of K^z and the latter is Σ_3^1 -correct. Hence there must be an $s' \in B$ with $s' \in K^z$. Hence $s' \in M$ as required.

References

- [1] H. FRIEDMAN, *Minimality in the Δ_2^1 -degrees*, in Fundamenta Mathematicae, vol. 81, 1974, pp.183-192.
- [2] A.KANAMORI, *The Higher Infinite* Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [3] A. KECHRIS, *Minimal Upper Bounds for sequences of Δ_{2n}^1 -degrees* in J. Symbolic Logic, vol. 43 (1978), pp.502-507.
- [4] A. KECHRIS, *Forcing with Δ perfect trees and minimal Δ -degrees* in J. Symbolic Logic, vol. 46 (1981), pp.803-816.
- [5] A. KECHRIS, *Homogeneous Trees and Projective Scales* in Cabal Seminar 77-99, Ed. A. Kechris, D.A. Martin, Y. Moschovakis, Springer Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 839, 1981, 33-74.
- [6] W. MITCHELL, E. SCHIMMERLING, & J. R. STEEL, *The Covering Lemma up to a Woodin Cardinal* to appear in the Annals of Pure and Applied Logic.
- [7] W. MITCHELL & J. R. STEEL, *Fine Structure for Iteration Trees* Lecture Notes in Logic No.3, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1994.

- [8] G. SACKS, *Forcing with perfect closed sets in* Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics, vol. 13, part 1, Ed. D.Scott, AMS, providence, Rhode Island, 1971, pp.351-335.
- [9] G. SACKS, *Countable Admissible ordinals and hyperdegrees* in Advances in Mathematics, vol. 20, 1976, pp.213-262.
- [10] J. R. STEEL, *The Core Model Iterability Problem* circulated manuscript (1990), to appear.
- [11] P.D.WELCH, *Minimality in the Δ_3^1 -degrees*, J.Symbolic Logic, vol 52, 1987, pp.908-915.
- [12] P.D.WELCH, *Some descriptive set theory and core models*, in Annals of Pure and Applied Logic, vol 39, 1988, pp.273-290.